

### REMARKS

In response to the action dated February 14, 2006, Applicant confirms election of Group I, drawn to a nipple, and more particularly to the embodiment shown in FIG. 13 (Nipple 410). Independent Claims 1, 14, 15, 16, 19, 30, 39, 70, 71 and 72 read on the species elected. Accordingly, Claims 1-16, 19-60, 70-72 are believed to read on the nipple shown in FIG. 13.


Applicant's acquiescence in this restriction requirement is not to be taken as any admission of the merit of or accuracy of the positions taken by the Examiner in this non-substantive Office Action. In fact, several assertions made by the examiner do not bear up under careful scrutiny. For example, in one instance, the specification makes clear that the nipple of FIG. 14 (species of nipple 512) is a close up partial view of FIG. 10 (species of nipple 310); therefore, it is not understood how the nipples of FIG. 10 and FIG. 14 can be considered patentably distinct.

Applicant also disagrees with the statement that there are no generic claims. Several of the independent claims appear to be generic to the extent that they would encompass more than one of the breakdown of species asserted by the examiner. As just one example, Claim 1 should be considered generic for several, if not all, of the nipples shown in the figures. Claims 14, 15, 16, 19, 30, 39 should be considered generic for several, if not all, of the nipples shown in the figures. Claim 70 should be considered generic to at least two of the nipples shown in the figures. If any of these claims are ultimately allowed, it is believed that they should apply to more of the nipples than that shown in only FIG. 13, the elected species 410.

June 14, 2006

BANIAK PINE & GANNON  
150 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 1200  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 673-0360

Respectfully submitted,

  
Michael H. Baniak / Steven B. Courtright  
Registration No. 30,608 / 40,966  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)